

### PUBLIC MATTER

FILED AT

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL SCOTT J. DREXEL, No. 65670 OCT 17 2008

CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL
RUSSELL G. WEINER, No. 94504
DEPUTY CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL

DEPUTY CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL LAWRENCE J. DAL CERRO, No. 104342

4 LAWRENCE J. DAL CERRO, No. 10434 ASSISTANT CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL 5 ALLEN BLUMENTHAL, No. 110243

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA

SUPERVISING TRIAL COUNSEL ROBIN BRUNE, No. 149481

DEPUTY TRIAL COUNSEL

7 TREVA STEWART, No. 239829 ASSIGNED DEPUTY TRIAL COUNSEL

8 | 180 Howard Street

1

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

San Francisco, California 94105

Telephone: (415) 538-2218

STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO

THE STATE BAR COURT

### HEARING DEPARTMENT - SAN FRANCISCO

In the Matter of

) Case No.: 08-O-11900

LOUIS J. PERKINS, No. 140056

NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES

A Member of the State Bar.

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

23

24

25

2627

28

IF YOU FAIL TO FILE AN ANSWER TO THIS NOTICE WITHIN THE TIME ALLOWED BY STATE BAR RULES, INCLUDING EXTENSIONS, OR IF YOU FAIL TO APPEAR AT THE STATE BAR COURT TRIAL, (1) YOUR DEFAULT SHALL BE ENTERED, (2) YOU SHALL BE ENROLLED AS AN INACTIVE MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR AND WILL NOT BE PERMITTED TO PRACTICE LAW UNLESS THE DEFAULT IS SET ASIDE ON MOTION TIMELY MADE UNDER THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE STATE BAR, (3) YOU SHALL NOT BE PERMITTED TO PARTICIPATE FURTHER IN THESE PROCEEDINGS UNLESS YOUR DEFAULT IS SET ASIDE, AND (4) YOU SHALL BE SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL DISCIPLINE.

**NOTICE - FAILURE TO RESPOND!** 

STATE BAR RULES REQUIRE YOU TO FILE YOUR WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THIS NOTICE WITHIN TWENTY DAYS AFTER SERVICE.

IF YOUR DEFAULT IS ENTERED AND THE DISCIPLINE IMPOSED BY THE SUPREME COURT IN THIS PROCEEDING INCLUDES A PERIOD OF ACTUAL SUSPENSION, YOU WILL REMAIN SUSPENDED FROM THE PRACTICE OF LAW FOR AT LEAST THE PERIOD OF TIME SPECIFIED BY THE SUPREME COURT. IN ADDITION, THE ACTUAL SUSPENSION

WILL CONTINUE UNTIL YOU HAVE REQUESTED, AND THE STATE BAR COURT HAS GRANTED, A MOTION FOR TERMINATION OF THE ACTUAL SUSPENSION. AS A CONDITION FOR TERMINATING THE ACTUAL SUSPENSION, THE STATE BAR COURT MAY PLACE YOU ON PROBATION AND REQUIRE YOU TO COMPLY WITH SUCH CONDITIONS OF PROBATION AS THE STATE BAR COURT DEEMS APPROPRIATE. SEE RULE 205, RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR STATE BAR COURT PROCEEDINGS.

The State Bar of California alleges:

### **JURISDICTION**

1. Louis J. Perkins ("Respondent") was admitted to the practice of law in the State of California on June 6, 1989, was a member at all times pertinent to these charges, and is currently a member of the State Bar of California.

### **COUNT ONE**

Case No. 07-O-14812
Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(A)
[Commingling Personal Funds in Client Trust Account]

- 2. Respondent wilfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(A), by depositing or commingling funds belonging to Respondent in a bank account labeled "Trust Account," "Client's Funds Account" or words of similar import, as follows:
- 3. During at least from March, 2008 to the present, respondent maintained an attorney-client trust account, account number #X-XXX-XXX-2179<sup>1</sup> at U.S. Bank (hereinafter, "CTA account"). On or about March 13, 2008, U.S. Bank notified the State Bar of two insufficient funds (hereinafter, "NSF") transactions in respondent's attorney-client trust account.
- 4. On or before March 6, 2008, respondent issued the following checks when there were insufficient funds in the account to cover these checks:

Date <sup>2</sup>	Check Number	Amount	Balance <sup>3</sup>	<u>Payee</u>
3/06/08	1266	\$161.57	- 99.35	A T & T
3/06/08	1263	\$29.10	-99.35	FedEx

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The full account number has been redacted due to concern about theft.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> This is the date that the check was presented for payment.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The balance in respondent's CTA account when the check was presented for payment.

9

10

8

11 12

14 15

13

16

- 5. On or about March 10, 2008, U.S. Bank notified respondent, in writing, of the NSF transaction. U.S. Bank covered the NSF transactions for respondent, but notified respondent of an \$8.00 per day overdraft fee. U.S. Bank sent respondent the NSF transaction notice to him at 3353 Bradshaw Road, Suite 232, Sacramento, California 95827.
  - Respondent received the notice and was aware of its contents. 6.
- 7. On or about March 7, 2008, respondent deposited a check for \$1,338.02 into his CTA account. This check was issued to Louis J. Perkins, Esq. from Jan Johnson, Chapter 13 Trustee, reference Debtor Peter Skillman. The funds from this deposit covered the NSF transactions of March 3, 2006.
- 8. The State Bar subpoenaed a portion of respondents CTA account, including statements from January 2, 2008 through July 31, 2008, with deposits and withdrawals that included additional records from December, 2007. A review of the records subpoenaed revealed that respondent was issuing funds for personal items from his CTA account, including, but not limited, to checks to the Laguna Creek 3<sup>rd</sup> Ward of the Mormon Church; to the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District ("SMUD"); Princeton Business Park; AT & T, and other non-client related expenditures, as follows:

17	<u>Date</u>	Check #	Amount	Payee
18	12/29/07	1229	\$ 125.00	Premier Storage
19	12/11/07	12490	\$ 11.94	Pulse TV
20	12/31/07	1247	\$1098.00	Princeton Business Park
21	12/28/07	1244	\$ 173.13	Reliable Office Supplies
22	01/08/08	1158	\$ 101.19	SMUD
23	01/31/08		\$ 300.00	State Bar of CA
24	02/15/08	1253	\$1098.00	Princeton Business Park
25	03/01/08	1267	\$ 260.74	SMUD
26	03/01/08	1264	\$ 187.87	SMUD
27	03/01/08	1265	\$ 379.36	AT & T
28	03/01/08	1266	\$ 161.57	AT & T

1       03/11/08       1269       \$1098.00       Princeton Busin         2       04/11/08       1270       \$620.00       Princeton Busin         3       04/20/08       1272       \$600.00       Laguna Creek Town         4       04/19/08       1275       \$83.00       DMV         5       05/11/08       1277       \$1098.00       Princeton Busin         6       05/13/08       1281       \$140.00       SMUD         7       06/10/08       1278       \$1098.00       Princeton Busin         8       07/06/08       1282       \$2045.00       Laguna Creek 3	
3       04/20/08       1272       \$ 600.00       Laguna Creek 7         4       04/19/08       1275       \$ 83.00       DMV         5       05/11/08       1277       \$1098.00       Princeton Busing         6       05/13/08       1281       \$ 140.00       SMUD         7       06/10/08       1278       \$1098.00       Princeton Busing         8       07/06/08       1282       \$2045.00       Laguna Creek 3	siness Park
4       04/19/08       1275       \$ 83.00       DMV         5       05/11/08       1277       \$1098.00       Princeton Busing SMUD         6       05/13/08       1281       \$ 140.00       SMUD         7       06/10/08       1278       \$1098.00       Princeton Busing Superior Super	siness Park
5       05/11/08       1277       \$1098.00       Princeton Busin         6       05/13/08       1281       \$ 140.00       SMUD         7       06/10/08       1278       \$1098.00       Princeton Busin         8       07/06/08       1282       \$2045.00       Laguna Creek 3	k Third Ward
6 05/13/08 1281 \$ 140.00 SMUD 7 06/10/08 1278 \$1098.00 Princeton Busin 8 07/06/08 1282 \$2045.00 Laguna Creek 3	
7 06/10/08 1278 \$1098.00 Princeton Busin 8 07/06/08 1282 \$2045.00 Laguna Creek 3	siness Park
8 07/06/08 1282 \$2045.00 Laguna Creek 3	
	siness Park
	c 3rd
9 9. A review of the CTA account also revealed that there were d	disbursement

9. A review of the CTA account also revealed that there were disbursements made on behalf of clients from the account, as follows:

<u>Date</u>	Check	Amount	<u>Notation</u>
12/31/07	1251	\$299.00	Bankruptcy Court (Lunsford)
03/12/07	1257	\$350.00	refund client fee
01/28/08	1258	\$299.00	USBC (Mark)

10. By using his CTA for personal expenditures, as demonstrated by the aforementioned transactions, respondent commingled client and personal funds in his CTA account, in wilful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(A).

# Count TWO Case No. 07-O-14812 Business and Professions Code, section 6106 [Moral Turpitude]

- 11. Respondent wilfully violated Business and Professions Code, section 6106, by committing an act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty or corruption, as follows:
  - 12. The allegations of Count One are hereby incorporated by reference.
- 13. Respondent knew, or should have known, that there were insufficient funds in his account to cover the NSF transactions.

11

10

13

12

14 15

16

17

18

19

21

20

22 23

24

2.5

26

27

14. By issuing two checks on or before March 6, 2008, when respondent knew or should have known there would be insufficient funds to cover those transactions, respondent committed acts of moral turpitude, in wilful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106.

## COUNT THREE

Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i) [Failure to Cooperate in State Bar investigation]

- 15. Respondent wilfully violated Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i), by failing to cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent, as follows:
  - 16. The allegations of Counts One and Two are hereby incorporated by reference.
- 17. On or about March 20, 2008, State Bar paralegal Yee Leung (hereinafter, "Leung") wrote a letter to respondent. The letter was mailed via United States Mail, postage pre-paid, to respondent at his official membership records address, maintained by the State Bar pursuant to Business and Professions Code, section 6002.1, at 3353 Bradshaw Road, Suite 232, Sacramento, California 95827. In the letter, Leung advised respondent of the NSF transactions in his CTA account and requested that respondent provide a written explanation to the State Bar. The letter was not returned as undeliverable.
  - 18. Respondent received the March 20, 2008 letter and was aware of its contents.
- 19. Respondent did not respond to the March 20, 2008 letter or otherwise give the State Bar an explanation for the NSF transactions.
- 20. On or about April 11, 2008, State Bar paralegal Yee Leung wrote a second letter to respondent. The letter was mailed via United States Mail, postage pre-paid, to respondent at his official membership records address, maintained by the State Bar pursuant to Business and Professions Code, section 6002.1, at 3353 Bradshaw Road, Suite 232, Sacramento, California 95827. In the letter, Leung advised respondent of the prior letter. Leung advised respondent that a State Bar investigation would commence if the State Bar did not receive a full response. The letter was not returned as undeliverable.

- 21. Respondent received the April 11, 2008 letter and was aware of its contents.
- 22. Respondent did not respond to the April 11, 2008 letter or otherwise give the State Bar an explanation for the NSF transactions.
- 23. On or about June 3, 2008, State Bar Investigator F. Jacobs (hereinafter, "Jacobs") wrote a third letter to respondent. The letter was mailed via United States Mail, postage prepaid, to respondent at his official membership records address, maintained by the State Bar pursuant to Business and Professions Code, section 6002.1, at 3353 Bradshaw Road, Suite 232, Sacramento, California 95827. In the letter, Jacobs requested discovery and information regarding respondent's trust account, in connection with a State Bar investigation of the NSF transactions. Jacobs requested a response no later than June 17, 2008. The letter was not returned as undeliverable.
  - 24. Respondent received the June 3, 2008 letter and was aware of its contents.
- 25. Respondent did not respond to the June 3, 2008 letter or otherwise give the State Bar the requested discovery or explanation for the NSF transactions.
- 26. On or about June 30, 2008, Jacobs wrote another letter to respondent. The letter was mailed via United States Mail, postage pre-paid, to respondent at his official membership records address, maintained by the State Bar pursuant to Business and Professions Code, section 6002.1, at 3353 Bradshaw Road, Suite 232, Sacramento, California 95827. In the letter, Jacobs reminded respondent of her prior letter sent June 3, 2008. She advised that she has not received a response. Jacobs again requested a response to the June 3, 2008 letter, and she enclosed a copy of the June 3, 2008 letter. Jacobs requested a response no later than July 14, 2008. The letter was not returned as undeliverable.
  - 27. Respondent received the June 30, 2008 letter and was aware of its contents.
- 28. Respondent did not respond to the June 30, 2008 letter or otherwise give the State Bar the requested discovery or explanation for the NSF transactions.
- 29. By failing to respond to the letters of State Bar paralegal Leung and State Bar Investigator Jacobs, regarding the NSF transactions, respondent failed to cooperate and

participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent, in wilful violation of 2 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i). 3 **NOTICE - INACTIVE ENROLLMENT!** 4 YOU ARE HEREBY FURTHER NOTIFIED THAT IF THE STATE BAR COURT FINDS, PURSUANT TO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE 5 SECTION 6007(c), THAT YOUR CONDUCT POSES A SUBSTANTIAL THREAT OF HARM TO THE INTERESTS OF YOUR CLIENTS OR TO THE PUBLIC, YOU MAY BE INVOLUNTARILY ENROLLED AS AN INACTIVE MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR. YOUR INACTIVE 7 ENROLLMENT WOULD BE IN ADDITION TO ANY DISCIPLINE RECOMMENDED BY THE COURT. SEE RULE 101(c), RULES OF 8 PROCEDURE OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA. **NOTICE- COST ASSESSMENT!** 10 IN THE EVENT THESE PROCEDURES RESULT IN PUBLIC DISCIPLINE. YOU MAY BE SUBJECT TO THE PAYMENT OF COSTS INCURRED BY 11 THE STATE BAR IN THE INVESTIGATION, HEARING AND REVIEW OF THIS MATTER PURSUANT TO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 6086.10. SEE RULE 280, RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE 12 STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA. 13 Respectfully submitted, 14 THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA 15 OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL 16 17 Dated: October 17 , 2008 18 Robin Brune Deputy Trial Counsel 19 Treva Stewart 20 Assigned Deputy Counsel 21 22 23 24 25 26

27

### DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED - 7160 3901 9845 6046 8177

2

1

3

**CASE NUMBER: 08-O-11900** 

5

6 7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

I, the undersigned, over the age of eighteen (18) years, whose business address and place of employment is the State Bar of California, 180 Howard Street, Seventh Floor, San Francisco, California 94105-1639, declare that I am not a party to the within action; that I am readily familiar with the State Bar of California's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service; that in the ordinary course of the State Bar of California's practice, correspondence collected and processed by the State Bar of California would be deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day; that I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing affidavit. That in accordance with the practice of the State Bar of California for collection and processing of mail, I deposited or placed for collection and mailing in the City and County of San Francisco, on the date shown below, a true copy of the within

### NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES

in a sealed envelope placed for collection and mailing as certified mail, return receipt requested, Article No.: 7160 3901 9845 6046 8177, at San Francisco, on the date shown below, addressed to:

Louis J. Perkins 3353 Bradshaw Rd., #232 Sacramento, CA 95827

in an inter-office mail facility regularly maintained by the State Bar of California addressed to:

#### N/A

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at San Francisco, California, on the date shown below.

Dated: October 17, 2008

Signed: